



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/653,231	09/03/2003	Yoshinori Sugahara	325772033100	4832

7590
Barry E. Bretschneider
Morrison & Foerster LLP
Suite 300
1650 Tysons Boulevard
McLean, VA 22102

06/28/2007

EXAMINER

SINGH, SARBJIT

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2609

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/28/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/653,231

Applicant(s)

SUGAHARA ET AL.

Examiner

Sarbjit Singh

Art Unit

2609

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 September 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION***Drawing Objections***

The drawings (figures 1, 2, 4, and 5) are objected to because of various minor informalities. In figure 1, the element 53b should read as port B instead of "port A". In figure 2, the "conected device" of element 70a and the element 57 "rasterizar" are misspelled. In figure 4, the "conekted device" of element 70a, the "conected device" of element 70b, and the element 57 "rasteriser" are misspelled. Similarly, in figure 5, the "conekted device" of element 70a, the "conected device" of element 70b, and the element 57 "rasteriser" are misspelled. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner,

Art Unit: 2609

the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: such as *improper wording, "a multiple ports"*. Thus, appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In line 2 of claim 4, the phrase "relating to such tasks as" may lead to confusion over the intended scope of the claim and is thus indefinite.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In line 2 of claim 6, the phrase "such as" may lead to confusion over the intended scope of the claim and is thus indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. **Claim 7** is drawn to functional descriptive material NOT claimed as residing on a computer readable medium.

MPEP 2106.IV.B.1 (a) (Functional Descriptive Material) states:

“Data structures not claimed as embodied in a computer-readable medium are descriptive material per se and are not statutory because they are not capable of causing functional change in the computer.”

“Such claimed data structures do not define any structural or functional interrelationships between the data structure and other claimed aspects of the invention which permit the data structure’s functionality to be realized.”

Claim 7, while defining a program product, does not define a “computer-readable medium” and is thus non-statutory for that reasons. A program product can range from paper on which the program is written, to a program simply contemplated and memorized by a person. The examiner suggests amending the claim to embody the program on “computer-readable medium” in order to make the claim statutory.

Specifically, the examiner recommends the following as an example of statutory claim language: “A computer readable medium encoded with a computer program...”. Refer to Annex IV, section (a) of the USPTO “Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility”, official Gazette notice of 22 November 2005 (currently at <http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/com/sol/og/2005/week47/patgupa.htm>).

Art Unit: 2609

"In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with the data structure defines structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and the computer software and hardware components which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory." – MPEP

2106.IV.B.1 (a)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless-

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 4, 7, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Takamiya Hiroyoshi, US PG PUB 2003/0025934 (hereafter referenced as Takamiya).

Regarding **claim 1**, in the Summary Of The Invention (page 1 paragraphs 0012-0014), Takamiya discloses a printing device for performing printing in accordance with a print job, which is input externally, including a setting unit for setting names of multiple input ports and functions corresponding to the multiple

Art Unit: 2609

input ports. In addition, Takamiya discloses a printing unit for performing print processing in accordance with a function corresponding to the input port to which the print job is input. Takamiya further discloses the setting unit that can set multiple e-mail addresses registered for the printing device as the multiple input ports. Thus, when an e-mail is received in one of the e-mail addresses registered for the printing device, the printing unit may perform print processing in accordance with the function corresponding to the e-mail address.

The above disclosed invention of Takamiya reads on "A printing apparatus comprising a multiple ports that receive print jobs are logically set, and attributes used for specifying printing settings are assigned to at least one of the said multiple ports; and a controller that, when a print job is received, processes said print job based on the printing settings specified in the attributes while referring to the port that received the print job".

More specifically, Takamiya (page1 paragraphs 0012-0014) discloses a *setting unit for setting names of multiple input ports and functions corresponding to the multiple input ports* which reads on "multiple ports that receive print jobs are logically set, and attributes used for specifying printing settings are assigned to at least one of the said multiple ports"; wherein, *setting names of multiple input ports* reads on "multiple ports that receive print jobs are logically set", *setting functions corresponding to the multiple input ports* reads on "attributes used for specifying printing settings are assigned to at least one of the said multiple ports". Furthermore, a *printing unit for performing print processing in accordance with a function corresponding to the input port to which the print job is input* reads

Art Unit: 2609

on "a controller that, when a print job is received, processes said print job based on the printing settings specified in the attributes while referring to the port that received the print job"; wherein, *a printing unit* reads on "a controller", and a *function* reads on "attributes".

Regarding **claim 10**, Takamiya (page 6 claim 6) discloses a method for controlling a printing device which performs printing in accordance with a print job includes *a setting step for setting names of a plurality of input ports and functions corresponding to the plurality of input ports*. Takamiya further discloses *a printing step to perform print processing in accordance with a function corresponding to the input port to which the print job is input*. More specifically, in claim 7 (page 7), it further discloses *a method to control a printing device, wherein the setting step can set a plurality of e-mail addresses registered for the printing device as the plurality of input ports, and wherein, when an e-mail is received in one of the e-mail address registered for the printing device, the printing step performs print processing in accordance with the function corresponding to the email address*.

In claim 6 (Takamiya), *a setting step for setting names of a plurality of input ports* reads on "logically setting multiple ports", *a setting step for setting functions corresponding to the plurality of input ports* reads on "assigning attributes used for specifying the printing settings to at least one of said multiple ports"; wherein, *functions* read on "attributes", and *a printing step to perform print processing in accordance with a function corresponding to the input port to which the print job is input* reads on "processing a received print job based on the

Art Unit: 2609

printing settings specified for the attributes of the port that received the print job while referring to the attributes for said port".

In claim 7 (Takamiya), *when an e-mail is received in one of the e-mail addresses registered for the printing device, the printing step performs print processing in accordance with the function corresponding to the email address* reads on "processing a received print job based on the printing settings specified for the attributes of the port that received the print job while referring to the attributes for said port"; wherein, *e-mail* reads on "print job", *e-mail addresses* read on "input ports", and *the function* reads on "attributes".

Regarding **claim 7**, Takamiya (pages 6-7 claims 6 & 13) discloses a computer software program code for implementing a method for controlling a printing device which consists a setting step for setting names of a plurality of input ports and functions corresponding to the plurality of input ports and a printing step for performing print processing in accordance with a function corresponding to the input port to which the print job is input.

The above said computer software program discloses by Takamiya reads on "A program product that controls a printing apparatus, wherein multiple ports that receive print jobs are logically set and attributes used for specifying printing settings are assigned to at least one of said multiple ports, and wherein said printing apparatus is controlled such that when a print job is received, said print job is processed based on the printing settings specified in the attributes while referring to the port that received the print job".

Art Unit: 2609

More specifically, *a computer software program code for implementing a method for controlling a printing device which consists a setting step for setting names of a plurality of input ports and functions corresponding to the plurality of input ports* reads on "A program product that controls a printing apparatus, wherein multiple ports that receive print jobs are logically set and attributes used for specifying printing settings are assigned to at least one of said multiple ports", wherein, *a computer software program code for implementing a method for controlling a printing device* reads on "A program product that controls a printing apparatus", *a setting step for setting names of a plurality of input ports and functions corresponding to the plurality of input ports* reads on "multiple ports that receive print jobs are logically set and attributes used for specifying printing settings are assigned to at least one of said multiple ports".

Furthermore, *a printing step for performing print processing in accordance with a function corresponding to the input port to which the print job is input* reads on "printing apparatus is controlled such that when a print job is received, said print job is processed based on the printing settings specified in the attributes while referring to the port that received the print job", wherein, *print processing in accordance with a function corresponding to the input port* reads on "print job is processed based on the printing settings specified in the attributes while referring to the port that received the print job".

Regarding **claim 4**, Takamiya, in abstract, specifically discloses *a printing device with multiple finishing functions (edit functions such as stapling)* and multiple e-mail accounts on a mail server in a network. Takamiya further

Art Unit: 2609

discloses that an e-mail sent to each e-mail account undergoes a finishing function (edit function) based on the stored correspondence between finishing functions (edit functions) and e-mail accounts stored in a printing device. **More specifically, the correspondence between e-mail accounts (e-mail addresses) and finishing functions (edit functions) are stored in the address setting value correspondence table (see figure 14, page 3 paragraph [0047]), which in turn is stored in a memory of the printing device. On page 5 paragraph [0071], it discloses a finishing function involving printing and controls over components of the image forming portion, such as a function involving sorting and/or stapling processing. The examiner has noticed that the claimed invention "said printing settings include[ing] finishing settings relating to such tasks as stapling and hole punching" reads on Takamiya's page 5 paragraph [0071], function involving sorting and/or stapling processing. See also STAPLE function in figure 14.**

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2609

Claims 2, 3, 8, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takamiya in view of Suzuki et al, US Patent 7,113,299 (hereafter referenced as Suzuki).

Regarding **claim 2**, Takamiya meets all of the limitations of the claim with the exception of disclosing that the "attributes for at least one of said ports include user authorization information". However, it was well known in the art at the time of invention to include user authorization information in attributes for the said printing apparatus as evidenced by Suzuki. Suzuki discloses an Internet printing system, a device, and a method where a user can use his/her credit card as identification for printing over the network as shown in figures 1. In figure 1, *a host computer 10 includes a credit card reader 11. As depicted in column 8 lines 11-18, the credit card reader 11 may be a peripheral device such as any known magnetic card reader in which a credit card is swiped through the device. Alternatively, rather than being an external peripheral device, credit card reader 11 may be integrated with computer 10 such as any known credit card reader which is incorporated into a keyboard. The computer 10 is then connected to a printer/copier 22/21 via network 1. The printer/copier 21/22 may be incorporated (embedded) with a network interface device 25 and a credit card reader 23 as depicted in column 9 lines 26-31.*

In column 5 lines 17-28, Suzuki discloses *an invention which prints a print job by swiping a credit card through a credit card reader at a printing device, and in response to the swiping, the printing device printing a print job which has*

Art Unit: 2609

associated credit card information corresponding to the swiped credit card.

Further, in response to the credit card swiping, the printing device transmits the credit card information to a print data storage device which stores print jobs having credit card information associated therewith, and the print data storage server transmits to the printing device a print job having associated credit card information corresponding to the credit card information transmitted by the printing device. Column 5 lines 29-31 discloses that a print job can be retrieved at a printer merely by walking up to the printer and swiping a credit card through a credit card reader connected to the printer.

Examiner noticed that the credit card information would perform secure/safe printing for a user as he/she would use the credit card information as an Identification/authorization. Additional security would be provided for due to hashing of the credit card number and storing the hashed value rather than storing the credit card number as well as transmitting the hashed value by network interface device instead of transmitting the credit card number. Furthermore, additional printing benefits can be provided for a registered/authorized Internet printing service user such as a registered/authorized user may be able to use the Internet printing service provider as a backup storage device to store print jobs for an unlimited time period, a registered/authorized user may be able to get a discounted printing rates for utilizing the Internet printing service. Examiner further noticed that the credit card information can be entered as

part of a print job in an e-mail (virtual input port in Takamiya) addressed to the printing device (Takamiya).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the above *printing with credit card as identification* disclosed by Suzuki in the printing device of Takamiya for the purpose of secure/authorize printing via credit card information

Regarding **claim 3**, Takamiya meets all of the limitations of the claim with the exception of disclosing that the "attributes for at least one of said ports include fee charging information indicating the fee to be charged for the use of each port". However, it was well known in the art at the time of invention to include fee charging information in the attributes for the said printing apparatus as evidenced by Suzuki. Suzuki discloses a printing system, a device, and a method where a user can use his/her credit card as identification as well as to pay for the printing services provided by the network print service provider. Suzuki in figure 6 disclosed steps where a user can upload print files and enter credit card information to calculate the total cost for each uploaded print file. The credit card information can be entered as shown in figure 26 and column 14 lines 38-54. The credit card information and the requested print job is then transferred to the network printing service provider and then to the printing device incorporated with a credit card reader (figure 1) and a network interface device (figure 4).

Takamiya in figure 3 discloses a schematic diagram of print processing where a host computer 301 is used to send print jobs via mail server 302 to a

Art Unit: 2609

printing device 303 (a copier, a printer or a fax machine as depicted on page 6 paragraph 0081). Takamiya further disclosed that his *invention may be applied to a system including multiple devices such as a host computer, an interface device, a reader and a printer (column 6 paragraph 0081).*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate Takamiya (figure 3, column 6 paragraph 0081) with Suzuki (figures 1, 2, 4, 6, 26) to have a printing system with fee charging information settings associated with ports (email addresses as mentioned by Takamiya). The resultant system is then configured with the computer software program codes and methods disclosed by Takamiya (page 6 paragraphs 0082-0086, claims 6-11) and Suzuki (column 22 lines 47-63, figures 2 and 4). As a result, the modified version of Takamiya's printing device would perform print processing in accordance with a function corresponding to the input port to which the print job is input with an addition of *credit card information use (Suzuki)* to pay for the printing services for the use of each port.

Regarding **claim 8**, Takamiya meets all of the limitations of the claim with the exception of disclosing that the "user authorization information is assigned as an attribute associated with at least one of said multiple ports". However, it was well known in the art at the time of invention to assign user authorization information as an attribute for at least one of multiple ports for the said printing apparatus as evidenced by Suzuki.

Suzuki (column 20 lines 1-18) discloses an Internet printing system where a user can use his/her credit card information as identification/authorization for

Art Unit: 2609

printing over the network. As Suzuki depicts, a user first uploads a print job from the computer workstation, where the print job consists of print data and credit card information. The uploaded print data and credit card information is stored in a server with a correspondence table linking the credit card information and the uploaded print data. To retrieve the print job, a user simply swipes his/her credit card through a credit card reader connected (either via a port or embedded in the printer) to a printer (where the printer is part of an Internet printing network of service providers) and the user's print job is printed out at the printer.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in art at the time of invention to modify Takamiya's *e-mail responsive printing apparatus* according to Suzuki's *printing with credit card as identification over the network* for the purpose of secure printing over the network. The resultant printing system is then configured and programmed with the computer software program codes and methods disclosed by Takamiya (page 6 paragraphs 0082-0086, claims 6-11) and Suzuki (column 22 lines 47-63, figures 2 and 4). As a result, the modified version of Takamiya's printing apparatus would perform print processing in accordance with a function corresponding to the input port to which the print job is input with an addition of *credit card information as identification/authorization* information.

Regarding **claim 9**, Takamiya meets all of the limitations of the claim with the exception of disclosing that the "fee charging information that indicates a fee charged for use of a port is assigned as an attribute associated with at least one of said multiple ports". However, it was well known in the art at the time of

Art Unit: 2609

invention to assign fee charging information as an attribute for at least one of multiple ports for the said printing apparatus as evidenced by Suzuki.

Suzuki discloses an Internet printing system where a user can use his/her credit card information to pay for printing over the network. As Suzuki depicts, a user first uploads a print job (figure 20) from the computer workstation, where the print job consists of print data and credit card information. The user is then prompted to next step (figure 25), where the user is able to see the calculated price for the uploaded print data. The uploaded print data and credit card information is stored in a server with a correspondence table linking the credit card information and the uploaded print data. To retrieve the print job, a user simply swipes his/her credit card through a credit card reader connected (either via a port or embedded in the printer) to a printer (where the printer is part of an Internet printing network of service providers) and the user's print job is printed out at the printer.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in art at the time of invention to incorporate Takamiya's *e-mail responsive printing apparatus* with Suzuki's *printing with credit card as identification over the network* to have a printing system with fee charging information settings associated with ports (email addresses as mentioned by Takamiya). The resultant printing system is then configured and programmed with the computer software program codes and methods disclosed by Takamiya (page 6 paragraphs 0082-0086, claims 6-11) and Suzuki (column 22 lines 47-63, figures 2 and 4). As a result, the modified version of Takamiya's printing apparatus would perform print processing in

Art Unit: 2609

accordance with a function corresponding to the input port to which the print job is input with an addition of *credit card information* to pay for the print job.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 5, 6, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takamiya.

Regarding **claim 5**, Takamiya does not specifically disclose “printing settings include settings relating to color and monochrome printing” in his e-mail responsive printing device.

However, Examiner takes Official Notice that it is well known in the art to incorporate the color and monochrome (grayscale) printing settings in such a printing device. The color and monochrome (grayscale) printing settings for a particular print job can be specified in the printer driver or in an e-mail (print job) addressed to the e-mail address (port) embedded in the printing device. The printing device would then print the print job according to those color and monochrome printing settings specified in the e-mail by looking up the *look-up* table, which is embedded in the printing device. The *look-up* table possibly includes a wide range of color/monochrome printing settings values. Thus, it would have been obvious to anyone of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include color/monochrome printing settings in Takamiya's printing device for the purpose of color and monochrome printing.

Regarding Claim 6, Takamiya does not specifically disclose “printing settings include RIP settings such as 1-UP and 2-UP settings” in his e-mail responsive printing device.

However, Examiner takes Official Notice that it is well known in the art to incorporate 1-UP and 2-UP settings in Takamiya as Takamiya does disclose N-1 (4-in-1 RIP processing settings to be more specific) processing as layout processing (paragraphs 0039-0040). More specifically, figure 3 and figure 14 (address setting value correspondence table) show 4-in-1 RIP (Raster Image Processing) processing and its mapping to the e-mail address embedded in the printing device as 4in1s@2prn.device.co.jp. The 4-in-1 print settings are created on a host computer and sent to the printing device via mail server as an e-mail content. The printing device then processes the print job according to the printing settings (4-in-1) specified in the e-mail by looking up in the address setting value table corresponds to said email (table 1401 figure 14). Thus, it would have been obvious to anyone of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include “1-UP” and “2-UP” settings in Takamiya as 1-in-1 and 2-in-1 processing as Takamiya already has N-1 processing settings for any number N.

Regarding claim 11, Takamiya does not specifically disclose “print resolution setting in the attributes for specifying said printing settings” in his e-mail responsive printing device.

Art Unit: 2609

However, Examiner takes Official Notice that it is well known in the art to include the print resolution settings in such a printing device. The examiner noticed that the resolution settings, for example, spatial resolution/tonal resolution settings can be specified for every print job in an e-mail addressed to the e-mail address (port) embedded in the printing device. The printing device of Takamiya would then be controlled in such a way that it would process the specified print job with an addition of print resolution settings. Thus, it would have been obvious to anyone of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include print resolution settings in Takamiya's printing device for the purpose of print jobs with print resolution settings.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sarbjit Singh whose telephone number is (571) 270-3260. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5, EST, alternating Fridays. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian T. Pendleton can be reached on (571) 272-7527. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Art Unit: 2609

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SS


BRIAN TYRONE PENDLETON
PRIMARY EXAMINER